



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/006,554 | 12/06/2001 | Farshid Sabet-Sharghi | SNDK.315US1 | 2639 |

66785 7590 04/30/2007
PARSONS HSUE & DE RUNTZ, LLP - SANDISK CORPORATION
595 MARKET STREET
SUITE 1900
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105

| |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

GELAGAY, SHEWAYE

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2137

| | |
|-----------|---------------|
| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|-----------|---------------|

04/30/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

72

| | | | |
|--------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|--|
| Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/006,554 | SABET-SHARGHI ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Shewaye Gelagay | 2137 | |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Shewaye Gelagay. (3) _____

(2) Peter Mikhail. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 18 April 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 4, 7 and 24.

Identification of prior art discussed: Hirota and Tagawa.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant discussed how Hirota does not teach calculating a media unique key for every cycle of decrypting a group of frames. Examiner pointed out that Hirota still reads on it when a track contains a single cycle of decrypting a group of frames. Applicant will amend the claims to show specifically how much content is decrypted for each cycle of decryption.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


EMMANUEL L. MOISE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required